



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/686,007	10/10/2000	Donald J. Palmer	10006545-1	4378	
75	590 07/29/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY			THOMPSON, MARC D		
Intellectual Prop P.O. Box 27240	perty Administration		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400		•	2144		

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



	Application No.	Applicant(s)	v
Advisory Action	09/686,007	PALMER ET AL.	-
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc D. Thompson	2144	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 21 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application to the same of th	ation. A proper reply to the places the application in the places the application in the places the	o a on in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Off timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI e date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for replying later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. Se R 1.136(a) and the approposition of the fee. The approportionally set in the final Of	. ee MPEP riate extension riate extension fice action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of		•
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b			
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			olifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a so	eparate, timely filed an	nendment
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT p	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were r	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			d an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examine	ır.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:	M	ARC D. THOMPSI RC THOMPSI IMARY EXAMIN	oN .

Continuation of 2.

NOTE: Minimally, the combination of the use of cost/consumable requirement data for scheduling print job(s) with the entirety of individual limitation(s) set forth in each dependent claim have not been properly searched together. That is, the new combinations of limitations now present in the dependent claim(s) have not been searched or treated in prior actions. Further, the proposed amendments fail to reduce or define any issues suitable for appeal or discussion beyond a general allegation that the previously set forth dependent claim(s) are not expressly provided by the prior art of record as applied in the final action mailed 4/20/2004. It is also noted that these newly presented independent claims stand rejected in the final action. Again, the newly formed combinations of limitations now present in the dependent claims have not been properly searched or treated, and would require further search and consideration to properly discern/determine patentability.

MARC D. THOMPSON
MRC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER